

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated February 10, 2004. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the Office Action are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 5-15 and 32 are pending. Claims 1 and 6 have been amended. Claim 32 has been added. Support for the claim changes and added claim can be found in the original disclosure, and therefore no new matter has been added. Claims 1, 6 and 32 are in independent form.

Claims 1-3, 6-10 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,263,250 (*Nishiwaki et al.*).

Claims 5 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nishiwaki et al.*

Claims 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nishiwaki et al.* in view of Japanese Patent Publication JP 2-187345 (JP '346).

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nishiwaki et al* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,548,894 (*Muto*).

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for conducting an interview with Applicants' representative on May 4, 2004. During the interview, alternative claim amendments were discussed to overcome the outstanding rejections. One proposed amendment was to lines 10-11 of Claim 1, and the other was to line 14 of Claim 1. The

Examiner agreed that either amendment would overcome *Nishiwaki et al.* Applicants have amended independent Claim 1 herein in the proposed fashion at lines 10-11. As the Examiner agreed in the interview, this amendment overcomes the applied art.

Independent Claim 6 has been amended in the same fashion as Claim 1. Since Claim 6 recites features similar or identical to Claim 1, Claim 6 is believed to be allowable over the applied art for at least the same reasons as pertain to Claim 1.

New Claim 32 is identical to Claim 1 (as that claim stood prior to the amendments made herein), but with the following changes having been made. First, the claim has been changed to incorporate the proposed amendment at line 14 that the Examiner agreed in the interview would overcome the art applied to Claim 1. Second, the claim has been changed to delete the word “ultraviolet” at line 8. Applicants submit that Claim 32 is allowable over *Nishiwaki et al.* for at least the same reasons as pertain to Claim 1.

A review of the other art of record, including *JP '346* and *Muto*, has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicants' opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of *Nishiwaki et al.*, as a reference against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons as pertain to the independent claims. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended in granting and conducting a personal interview with Applicants' representative on May 4, 2004. At the interview, the Examiner and Applicants' representative discussed the claims of record, principally Claim 1, in light of U.S. Patent No. 5,263,250 (*Nishiwaki et al.*). Applicants' representative presented arguments to the effect that each of the "wherein" clauses of Claim 1 distinguished that claim from *Nishiwaki et al.* In that regard, the Examiner and Applicants' representative discussed the proposed amendments recorded in the Interview Summary. The Examiner agreed that either of those proposed amendments would overcome *Nishiwaki et al.*

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicants
Douglas W. Pinsky
Registration No. 46,994

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200